

2 January

283

52

To The Hon The Constitutional
Convention of the State
of California

We the Undersigned
Members of the Bor of San Ber-
nardino County, do on behalf
of ourselves, and of the People
of said County, respectfully,
but earnestly protest against
any action of the Convention,
which will deprive South-
ern California of two sessions
of the Supreme Court Annu-
ally.

December 5 1878

W J. Curtis

Talbot & Harris

John W Satterwhite

W D F Hazle

Anders B. Cair

Bryce & Gregory

J W North

C W C Rowell

Harris & Goodell

John Brown, Jr.,

Geo. F. Haswell

Wm. J. Curtis

Petition

Relative to
Session of Sup-
Court

Dec 11/78

Read & referred
to Com of whole

E. Smith
as Sec

Presented by
H. B. Rolfe

2/

PETITION.

To the Honorable the President and members of the Convention to amend the Constitution of the State of California:

The undersigned memorialists, as citizens and members of the bar of San Diego county, respectfully represent to your honorable body:

That we have been unable to discover any hardship in the operation of the law requiring the Supreme Court to hold certain of its sessions at points outside of the Capital of the State. Nor have we been able to discover any good or even plausible reason, either from the arguments of the advocates of the proposed restrictive amendment, or from our own investigations, why a term or terms of the Supreme Court should not be profitably and conveniently held at points other than the Capital.

That no popular discontent has been manifested on the part of the people of the State at the action of the Legislature in providing for the holding of certain terms of the Supreme Court in San Francisco and Los Angeles; and that the suggested change in limiting the sessions of the said Court exclusively at the Capital by the organic law, is uncalled for by any public demand on the part of the people of the State.

That for ourselves, as citizens and members of the bar, and as far as public opinion has been manifested upon this subject within the sphere of our observation, we are convinced that the sentiment of the people of the State, and especially of the central and southern portions, is manifestly opposed to the adoption of any clause which would prevent the people of the State from legislating upon this subject as the future growing and changing interests of the people might demand.

That the rapid increase of population and wealth, involving a proportionate increase of business, in the southern part of the State, requires that the Legislature should, at least, be left at liberty to give us such terms of the Supreme Court as our future exigencies shall demand. Even at the present time our Supreme Court business is very large, as shown by the fact that the term just held at the city of Los Angeles has consumed three weeks of constant and arduous labor on the part of the court and counsel, and was yet insufficient to dispose of the business before the Court.

That, at the southern part of the State, sessions of the Supreme Court are required as a necessity, saving much time to counsel and litigants, besides the expense incident to more than a thousand miles of travel, from points in the southern counties to the Capital. And upon these grounds, and because no rights or privileges of others are infringed upon, we would hereby ask your honorable body to take such action as may prevent the incorporation of any such restrictive provision in the amended Constitution.

LEVI CHASE,	WILL M. SMITH,
W. T. MCNEALY,	W. J. WALKER,
E. W. HENDRICK,	W. J. HUNSAKER,
WALLACE LEACH,	W. J. GATEWOOD,

Memorial from
members of the
Bar of San Diego
in regard to ses-
sions of Supreme
Court.

Blackmer,

Nov 23/8

Read & ordered
printed & referred
to Com of Whole
Thomson
& East Bay

Blackmer

To the Honorable the President and members of the Convention to amend the Constitution of the State of California:

The undersigned memorialists, citizens and members of the bar of Los Angeles county, respectfully represent to your honorable body:

That we have been unable to discover any hardship in the operation of the law, requiring the Supreme Court to hold certain of its sessions at points outside the Capital of the State. Nor have we been able to discover any good or even plausible reason, either from the arguments of the advocates of the proposed restrictive amendment, or from our own investigations, why a term or terms of the Supreme Court should not be profitably and conveniently held at points other than the Capital.

That no popular discontent has been manifested on the part of the people of the State at the action of the Legislature in providing for the holding of certain terms of the Supreme Court in San Francisco and Los Angeles; and that the suggested change in limiting the sessions of the said Court exclusively at the Capital by the organic law, is uncalled for by any public demand on the part of the people of the State.

That for ourselves, as citizens and members of the bar, and as far as public opinion has been manifested upon this subject within the sphere of our observation, we are convinced that the sentiment of the people of the State, and especially of the central and southern portions, is manifestly opposed to the adoption of any clause which would prevent the people of the State from legislating upon this subject as the future growing and changing interests of the people might demand.

That the rapid increase of population and wealth, involving a proportionate increase of business, in the Southern part of the State, requires that the Legislature should, at least, be left at liberty to give us such terms of the Supreme Court as our future exigencies shall demand. Even at the present time our Supreme Court business is very large, as shown by the fact that the term just held at the city of Los Angeles has consumed three weeks of constant and arduous labor on the part of the court and counsel, and was yet insufficient to dispose of the business before the Court.

That, at the Southern part of the State, sessions of the Supreme Court are required as a necessity, saving much time to counsel and litigants, besides the expense incident to more than a thousand miles of travel, from points in the Southern counties to the capital. And upon these grounds, and because no rights or privileges of others are infringed upon, we would hereby ask your honorable body to take such action as may prevent the incorporation of any such restrictive provision in the amended Constitution.

Thos Rop
D Murray
R M Widney

1 M. L. Woods
2 Big Knell & White
3 W. H. Esby
4 B. L. Peel
5 J. H. Lewis
6 Wally S. Thompson
7 A. P. Ramirez
8 J. S. Bethune
9 R. F. de Valle
10 Julius Lyons
11 Thos & Smith
12 John F. Gougeon
13 W. M. Allen
14 Samuel Chapman & Smith
15 H. T. Lee
16 H. J. Gay
17 Thompson, Ellis & Gardner
18 Hartman & Haley
19 A. H. & C. M. Muench & Fautner
20 H. F. Hazen
21 Brooks, Clarke & Threlkeld
22 Barclay & Wilson
23 R. H. Chapman
24 F. H. Howard & J. Brownson of the firm
25 of Howard Brownson & Howard
26 J. H. Chapman
27 Bronson & Wells
28 Horan Bell

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Thos B. Brown

J. W. Cornell

J. W. W. Warner

H. M. Mitchell

Clarence F. Townsend

J. Rastman

J. A. Graves

Albert M. Stephens

Geo C. Little

J. J. Warner

A. J. King

A. B. Moring

Chas. L. S. S. S. S.

my S. S. S. S.

" S. S. S. S.

Y. Spilae

M. Scott

J. E. Griffin

J. Howard

WEDNESDAY, NOV. 6, 1878.

Supreme Court Statistics.

We have taken the trouble to collect some statistics concerning the Los Angeles term of the Supreme Court this Fall, as compared with the approaching Sacramento Term. The facts derived from the printed calendar, are interesting as throwing light on the sublime impudence of the Judiciary Committee of the Constitutional Convention, which seeks to establish the Supreme Court irremovably at Sacramento. We should premise that the Sacramento district consists of twenty-one counties, while the Los Angeles district has only seven. On the November calendar of the Supreme Court, which sits at Sacramento, there are forty-three cases from these twenty-one counties, as follows: Shasta, 2; Placer, 5; Lake, 2; Siskiyou 2; Butte, 2; Sacramento, 16; Yolo, 2; El Dorado, 2; Amador, 1; Nevada, 1; Yuba, 1; Sutter, 1; Tehama, 2; Modoc, 1; Lassen, 3.

Now mark the record of the seven counties of the Los Angeles district at the October Term just ended! It was as follows: Santa Barbara, 5; Ventura, 2; San Diego, 7; San Bernardino, 17; Inyo, 1; Kern, 13; Los Angeles, 27. Total 72.

Nothing could more conclusively confirm the wisdom of the California Legislature in establishing a branch of the Supreme Court for Southern California at Los Angeles than such an exhibit. It is worthy of remark that the litigation in this district is of a complex and important kind, embracing questions of irrigation and land law which test the patience and learning of the Judges to the utmost.

It is in the face of such an exhibit as this that Mr. Edgerton had the effrontery to propose, and the Judiciary Committee of the Constitutional Convention to recommend, the adoption of a constitutional provision fixing the Supreme Court at the State Capital. It is a vain task to attempt to arrest the course of development which, notwithstanding the legion of croakers of this section, is trending steadily southward. A trip through the old-time prosperous counties of Northern California is a melancholy experience. The population, money and litigation have set their faces in this direction. It is not in the power of any sectional favoritism to arrest the tide. To undo the work of the last Legislature in making a solitary concession to this section would be regarded by the whole of Southern California as an outrage.

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Petition of
Member of Los Angeles Bar
in reference to Sessions
of Supreme Court

Jan 9th
Recd by Mr Ayers
& asked to be placed
in the Archives of
Convention.

Thornton
and Secy

Ayers